

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-12, 14, and 16-20 are all the claims presently pending in the application. The Examiner has withdrawn claims 7, 9, and 18 from consideration. Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 14, and 19 to define the claimed invention more particularly. Applicants have canceled claim 21 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 10-12, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kurachi (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,436). Claims 4-6, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Thorne, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,958,005; hereinafter “Thorne”). Claim 1, 14, and 21 stand rejected under 35 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurachi in view of Koyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,897; hereinafter “Koyama”).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in the following discussion.

**I. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS**

**A. Claims 1 and 14**

With respect to claims 1 and 14, Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest, “*wherein the display image data is not encrypted by the encryption unit*”.

In rejecting claim 21, the Examiner alleged, “Kurachi teaches that the display image data is not encrypted by the encryption unit” (see Office Action dated January 9, 2008 at page 13). The Examiner attempts to rely on column 7, lines 16-23 of Kurachi to support his allegations. The Examiner’s allegations, however, are erroneous.

The passage relied upon by the Examiner merely discloses that print data is sent to a network printer through a network. This passage, however, does not even mention an

encryption unit or display image data, let alone teach or suggest that the display image data is not encrypted by the encryption unit.

Moreover, Koyama does not teach or suggest, “*wherein the display image data is not encrypted by the encryption unit*”. Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Koyama teaches or suggests this feature of the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest every feature of the claimed invention of claims 1 and 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**B. Claims 4-6, 10, 11, 16, 17, and 19**

With respect to claims 4-6, 10, 11, 16, 17, and 19, Applicants submit that Thorne does not teach or suggest “*a printing unit, which is responsive to a print command applied by said print command unit, for printing, on the same visible recording medium, the image that has been selected by said image selection unit and information relating to a copyright holder of the selected image*” (emphasis added by Applicants), as recited in exemplary claim 4, and somewhat similarly recited in claims 6, 10, 16, 17, and 19.

Indeed, Thorne does not even mention a copyright holder with respect to the printing operation.

The Examiner alleges, with respect to Thorne, “the system ascertains whether archiving has been enabled. If the response is negative archiving is disabled and the message archive icon and associated menu are deactivated. Archiving is inhibited.” (See Office Action dated January 9, 2008 at page 4).

Thorne merely teaches determining whether archiving has been enabled. Thorne, however, does not teach or suggest printing an image and printing information relating to a copyright holder of the selected image.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest every feature of the claimed invention of claims 4-6, 10, 11, 16, 17, and 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

### **C. Claims 12 and 20**

With respect to claims 12 and 20, the cited references do not teach or suggest, “*an aggregating unit for aggregating, for each of the plurality of printing units, the data which represents printing history and the format of which has been converted by said format conversion unit*”.

The Examiner alleges that this feature of the claimed invention is disclosed in column 11, lines 5-45 of Kurachi. Applicants submit, however, that this passage of Kurachi fails to support the Examiner’s allegations.

Kurachi merely teaches displaying print data from a plurality of printing units. Kurachi, however, does not teach or suggest aggregating the data from a plurality of printing units, wherein the data represents printing history.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest every feature of the claimed invention of claims 12 and 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

## **II.      FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1, 10-12, 14, 19, and 20 based on Kurachi fails to conform with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104, which states: “When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.”

(Emphasis added by Applicants).

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the rejection of claims 1, 10-12, 14, 19, and 20 does not identify the particular part relied upon and the pertinence of Kurachi has not been clearly explained. Indeed, the Examiner has merely copied Applicants’ claim language and provided vague references to passages in the disclosure of Kurachi.

If the Examiner wishes to maintain this rejection, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to conform the rejection to the standard set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.104. Applicants point out that this was previously pointed out to the Examiner. The Examiner, however, has maintained his rejections without conforming the rejection to the standard set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.104.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 4-7, 9-12, 14, and 16-20, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, Applicants request the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number

listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal  
interview.

The undersigned authorizes the Examiner to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit  
any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Scott M. Tulino, Esq.  
Reg. No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.  
Reg. No. 34,386

Date: April 9, 2008  
**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY**  
**LAW GROUP, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, Virginia 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
**Customer No. 21254**